

Sample Questions Contact Representative Entry Level Examination

The examination for the Contact Representative occupation measures the thinking skills that are critical for making decisions and solving problems on the job. The sample questions presented in this booklet are similar to the questions you will find in the actual examination. In general, the questions deal with topics that are related to Government business. *Remember, however, that no job knowledge is required to answer the questions correctly.*

LOGICAL REASONING

In each of these questions you will be given a paragraph or table which contains all the information necessary to identify the correct answer. Use **only** the information provided in the paragraph. Do not speculate or make assumptions that go beyond this information. Also, assume that all information given in the paragraph is true, even if it conflicts with some fact that is known to you.

In these questions you will be asked to select the only response option that can be validly concluded from the paragraph. Pay attention to negated verbs (for example, “are not”) and negative prefixes (for example, “incomplete” or “disorganized”). Also pay special attention to words such as “all,” “none,” and “some.” Keep in mind that, in some tests, words such as “all” and “none” often give away incorrect response options. That is **not** the case in this test. Some correct answers have the words “all” or “none” in them.

1. A person who is in legal proceedings to be deported from the United States may file Form 15 in order to attempt to stop the deportation. Neither U.S. citizens nor permanent U.S. residents may file Form 15. Furthermore, Form 15 must be filed with the Immigration Judge who is handling the legal deportation proceedings of the person being deported. Ms. N. is in legal proceedings to be deported from the United States.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that

- A) Ms. N. may not file Form 15 with the Immigration Judge who is handling her legal deportation proceedings
- B) Ms. N. may file Form 15 if she is a permanent U.S. resident
- C) if Ms. N. may file Form 15, then she is not a U.S. citizen
- D) Ms. N. may file Form 15 with the Immigration Judge who is handling her case only if she is a U.S. citizen
- E) if Ms. N. may file Form 15, then she is a permanent U.S. resident

The correct answer is response C. The answer is derived from information in the second sentence. The second sentence states that no U.S. citizens may file Form 15. Therefore, we can conclude that “if Ms. N may file Form 15, then she is not a U.S. citizen” because no U.S. citizens may file Form 15. From this information we can also conclude that Response D is incorrect. Response A contradicts the information in the third sentence. Responses B and E contradict the information in the second sentence, which states that permanent U.S. residents may not file Form 15.

2. The following table provides information on INS forms.

INS Form	Purpose	Processing Time	Processing Fee
AB-30	U.S. employment	6 months	\$30
GC-45	U.S. citizenship	12 months	\$25
HG-92	immigrant I.D.	9 months	\$35

Mr. Hiro wishes to receive an immigrant I.D. Therefore,

- A) Mr. Hiro should submit form GC-45.
- B) Mr. Hiro should submit \$30 with the proper INS form.
- C) Mr. Hiro must wait 9 months for the proper form to be processed.
- D) Mr. Hiro should not submit from HG-92.
- E) Mr. Hiro must wait 12 months for the proper form to be processed.

The correct answer is response C. The lead statement says that Mr. Hiro wishes to receive an immigrant I.D. The second column indicates that the form in the third row of the table is the proper form for receiving an immigrant I.D. The form in the third row is form HG-92, which has a processing time of 9 months and has a processing fee of \$35.

3. Phyllis T. is a former Federal employee who was entitled to benefits under the Federal Employee Compensation Act because of a job-related, disabling injury. When an eligible Federal employee has such an injury, the benefit is determined by this test: If the beneficiary is married or has dependents, benefits are $\frac{3}{4}$ of the person's salary at the time of the injury; otherwise, benefits are set at $\frac{2}{3}$ of the salary. Phyllis T.'s benefits were $\frac{2}{3}$ of her salary when she was injured.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that, when Phyllis T. was injured, she

- A) was married but without dependents
- B) was not married and had no dependents
- C) was not married but had dependents
- D) was married and had dependents
- E) had never been married

The correct answer is response B. This question concerns an either/or situation. The paragraph states that benefits under the Federal Employee Compensation Act are awarded at one level ($\frac{3}{4}$ of salary) if a beneficiary is married or has dependents when injured and at another level ($\frac{2}{3}$ of salary) if this is not true. Phyllis T. is eligible for benefits under the Act. The paragraph states that Phyllis T.'s benefit level was $\frac{2}{3}$ of her salary. Given this benefit level, it is clear that Phyllis T. did not meet either of the conditions for the $\frac{3}{4}$ level. Therefore, responses A, C, and D cannot be correct (A states that she was married, C states that she had dependents, and D states that she both was married and had dependents). Response E goes beyond the facts given because prior marriages are not listed as a factor relating to this benefit. The one correct conclusion is that Phyllis T. did not meet either requirement to qualify for the higher benefit level ($\frac{3}{4}$ of salary), so response B is the correct answer to the question.

4. Law enforcement agencies use scientific techniques to identify suspects and to establish guilt. One obvious application of such techniques is the examination of a crime scene. Some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination. Clothing fibers, dirt particles, and even pollen grains may reveal important information to the careful investigator. Nothing can be overlooked because all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that

- A) all substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are substances found at a crime scene
- B) no potential sources of evidence are substances found at a crime scene
- C) some substances found at a crime scene are not potential sources of evidence
- D) some potential sources of evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination
- E) no substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are substances found at a crime scene

The correct answer is response D. The essential information in the paragraph is contained in the third and fifth sentences. The third sentence tells us that "some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination." The fifth sentence explains that "...all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence." Therefore, we can conclude that "some potential sources of evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination." Response A **cannot** be inferred because the paragraph does not support the statement that all substances which yield valuable clues are found exclusively at a crime scene. It may be that valuable clues could be found elsewhere.

Responses B and C are incorrect because they contradict the fifth sentence of the paragraph, which clearly states that “all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.” Response E is incorrect because it contradicts the information in the third and fifth sentences.